

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/754,713 | Applicant(s) KEITH BROTHERS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner PONNOREAY PICH | Art Unit 2435 | |

All Participants:

(1) PONNOREAY PICH.

(2) Syed Javar Ali (reg. no. 58,780).

Date of Interview: 18 February 2009

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Ponnoreay Pich/
Examiner, Art Unit 2435

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called to inform Mr. Ali that the amendments he made to the independent claims was insufficient to overcome the art of record since the limitation he argued placed the application in condition for allowance was disclosed by the prior art of record. The examiner also alerted him to the fact that claim 37 appears to contain allowable subject matter and inquired as to whether the applicant would be willing to work with the examiner to somehow incorporate the subject matter therein into the independent claims. Mr. Ali stated he needed to talk to the client. The examiner waited a week for a decision and called back several times to check if a decision had been reached, but each time the examiner was informed that the client had not responded. During our last communication, the examiner informed Mr. Ali that because the examiner's own deadline to process the application was approaching and the client had been given sufficient time to come to a decision, the examiner was going to just send out an Office Action rather than wait any longer.